



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/755,036

01/08/2004

Stanley Bielak

10032

7885

7590 05/27/2009
STANLEY BEILAK
2128 BAYFRONT AVENUE TERRACE
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21409

EXAMINER

HONG, HYUN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2426

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/27/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/755,036	Applicant(s) BIELAK, STANLEY	
	Examiner Hyun J. Hong	Art Unit 2426	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Regarding claims 1-3, arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (US 2002/0087496) further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) further in view of Theall (US 2005/0108619).

Regarding claim 1, Huggins discloses a method for creating a presentation

Adding placeholder slides (fig. 10),

Uploading the presentation into the remote server which is accessible to end-users ([0023]),

However Huggins does not disclose creating user polls and quizzes on a remote server, generating a list of available polls and quizzes stored on the

Art Unit: 2426

remote server; replacing each placeholder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, recording information on what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll.

In analogous art, Stirpe discloses creating user polls and quizzes on a remote server ([0107] *polls and quizzes and all other relevant data go to the knowledge exchange of fig. 10*), generating a list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server ([0107, 0108]; replacing each placeholder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server ([0107], and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server ([0107])), recording information on what the end user has scored on a quiz ([0104]), feedback provided by the end-user on a poll ([0118]). It would have been obvious to combine the quiz system of Stirpe into the presentation of Huggins. This would allow an author to ensure that the viewers have watched their presentations.

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe also does not disclose taking a video stream including a plurality of video frames, each said video frame including a time stamp; and sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on said display device, starting from an initial video frame of said video stream.

In analogous art, Roelens discloses taking a video stream including a plurality of video frames, each said video frame including a time stamp; and sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on said display device, starting

Art Unit: 2426

from an initial video frame of said video stream ([0008,0009]). It would have been obvious to combine the video frame display of Roelens into the presentation of Huggins in view of Stirpe. This ensures that the video and audio of the presentation are synchronized.

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe further in view of Roelens does not disclose recording information regarding an end-user's usage of a presentation, said information including how far the end-user watched said presentation.

In analogous art, Joao discloses recording information regarding an end-user's usage of a presentation, said information including how far the end-user watched said presentation ([0036,0041]). It would have been obvious to combine the monitoring of Joao into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe further in view of Roelens. This would allow an author to monitor the progress of the presentation's viewers.

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao does not disclose that the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections.

In analogous art, Theall discloses that a presentation can be divided into any number of sections ([0055]). It would have been obvious to combine the sectioning of Theall into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao. This would give the author more options in creating a presentation.

Regarding claim 2, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses a method for playing a presentation including

Art Unit: 2426

polls or quizzes, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections ([0055] of Theall) comprising:

Receiving a presentation from a remote server ([0024] of Huggins)

Sequentially playing the frames, starting from an initial frame of the stream of data ([0008, 0009] of Roelens),

Selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local computer, content related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by the end user ([0107, 0108] of Stirpe).

Pausing said stream of data when one of the frames contains placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz stored on the remote server ([0107, 0108] of Stirpe *The presentation must be inherently paused for the users to be able to take the quiz*).

displaying the at least one of a poll and a quiz to be access by an end-user ([0107, 0108]);

Monitoring usage of said presentation ([0036, 0041] of Joao);

Recording information regarding each end-user's usage of said presentation, the information including an end user's identity ([0036-0041] of Joao) how far the end-user watched said presentation ([0036, 0041] of Joao), what the end user has scored on a quiz ([0104] of Stirpe), feedback by the end user on a poll ([0118] of Stirpe) and how much time the end-user spent watching said presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao) and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation ([0055] of Theall, [0036-0041] of Joao).

Art Unit: 2426

Regarding claim 3, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses a method of communicating between a presentation program; said program being stored on a computer readable medium executable by computer, and a remote server including interactive media when a presentation is being viewed by a user, said method comprising (see the rejection of claim 1):

Communicating a request for the presentation, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections (see the rejection of claim 1);

Receiving a stream of data from the server, including placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by a user (see the rejection of claim 1)

Pausing the stream of data when the placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz is received (see the rejection of claim 2);

Retrieving the at least one poll and quiz related to the received placeholder data from the remote server (see the rejection of claim 1);

Responding to the poll or quiz at a local computer by an end user (see the rejection of claim 1);

Uploading the poll or quiz results to the remote server (see the rejection of claim 1);

Monitoring usage of said presentation ([0036-0041] of Joao);

Recording information regarding each user's usage of said presentation, wherein said information includes a user's identity, how far the user watched said presentation, what the user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the user

Art Unit: 2426

on a poll, and how much elapsed time the user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation (see the rejection of claim 1)

Wherein said presentation includes video stream including a plurality of video frames, each said video frame including a time stamp; sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on a display device, starting from an initial video frame of said video stream; placeholder slides corresponding to a user polls, quizzes, or website links accessible via remote server, and wherein said end user selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local computer, content related to a poll or quiz to be accessed by the end user (see the rejection of claim 1).

Regarding claim 6, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses The method of displaying a presentation according to claim 2, wherein the polls or quiz results are stored for later analysis ([0104] of Stirpe).

Regarding claim 8, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses The method according to claim 3, wherein said information include information regarding which user watched which particular presentation and how far the user watched said presentation and how much time said user spent watching said presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 9, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses The method according to claim 3, wherein said information is reported and/or displayed to a user and/or presentation owner ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 10, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said polls or quiz results are stored for later analysis ([0104] of Stirpe)

Regarding claim 11, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation indexing a video and slides to allow a user to jump to different portions of the presentation ([0015] of Stirpe).

Regarding claim 12, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation is paused for a poll or quiz when the poll or quiz is initiated by said user or required by said presentation ([0107, 0108] of Stirpe).

Regarding claim 13, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation program synchronizes a video with active server pages references that point to specific polls or quizzes ([0107, 0108] of Stirpe).

Regarding claim 16, see claim 1.

Regarding claim 17, see claim 2.

Regarding claim 18, see claim 3.

Regarding claim 19, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the information further includes which end-user watched which particular presentation, and how much time the end-user spent watching the particular presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Art Unit: 2426

Regarding claim 20, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the information further includes information regarding when an end-user exits said presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Claims 4, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (US 2002/0087496) further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) further in view of Theall (US 2005/0108619) as applied to claim 1 above, further in Coughlin (US 2003/0034999).

Regarding claim 4, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising collecting indexing and other data from a server database and displaying said indexing and other data to a presentation's author creating indexes for users to look up presentations based on content ([0015] of Stirpe).

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall does not disclose log-on that validates authors.

In analogous art, Coughlin discloses log-on that validates authors (fig. 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the validation of Coughlin into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall. This would prevent any unauthorized editing of a presentation.

Regarding claim 14, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall in view of Coughlin discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein an end user accesses said presentation by providing a valid authorization key (fig. 15 of Coughlin).

Claims 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (US 2002/0087496) further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) further in view of Theall (US 2005/0108619) as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Mills (US 2004/0010470).

Regarding claim 5, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein said presentation is hosted by said remote server, and said remote server hosting presentations user tracking and monitoring ([0036-0041] of Joao)) indexing for users to look up select presentations ([0015] of Stirpe).

However, Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall does not disclose encrypting presentation content and deploying licenses for viewing protected content.

In analogous art, Mills discloses Encrypting presentation content and deploying licenses for viewing protected content ([0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the encryption of Mills into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in

Art Unit: 2426

view of Joao in view of Theall. This would prevent any unauthorized access of the presentations.

Claims 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Stirpe (US 2002/0087496) further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) further in view of Theall (US 2005/0108619) further in view of Coughlin (US 2003/0034999) as applied to claim 14 above, further in view of Mills (US 2004/0010470).

Regarding claim 15, Coughlin discloses the method according to claim 14 and presentation program shutdown (fig. 41 "X" of Coughlin). However, Coughlin not disclose presentation program shutdown if the user attempts to access an encrypted presentation without an authorized key.

In analogous art, Mills discloses presentation program shutdown if the user attempts to access an encrypted presentation without an authorized key ([0034] of Mills).

It would have been obvious to combine the encrypted presentation of Mills into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Stirpe in view of Roelens in view of Joao in view of Theall in view of Coughlin. This would prevent unauthorized use of the presentation program.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hyun J. Hong whose telephone number is (571)270-1553. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30a-7:00p).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hirl can be reached on (571)272-3685. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2426

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joseph P. Hir/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426
May 22, 2009

/H. J. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2426